UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/619,384 | 07/14/2003 | M. Scott Corson | Flarion-52 &65APP (80) | 5434 |

26479 7590 12/19/2007

STRAUB & POKOTYLO
620 TINTON AVENUE
BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR
TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LEE, BETTY E | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2619 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 12/19/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/619,384 | CORSON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Betty Lee | 2619 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28 and 30-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28 and 30-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 1-53 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1 line 19, it is suggested that "important to" be changed to --- used in --- similar to line 16. Claims 4-6, 9, 13, 14, 46, 48, 50, and 51 have similar problems.

In claim 27 line 3, it is suggested that "critical" be changed to --- used in routing signals --- similar to line 8. Claims 28, 31, and 33 have similar problems.

In claim 39 line 15, "devcie" should be changed to --- device ---.

In claim 39 line 25, "moible" should be changed to --- mobile ---.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10-12, 15-17, 18-24, 28, 40, 41, and 47 are objected to as being dependent on objected base claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims **4, 14, 25, 27, 28, 36, 37, 50, and 51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228).

**Regarding claims 4, 25, 27, 28, 50 and 51,** Lehtovirta teaches receiving a fault signal indicating a network node fault (see paragraphs 44 and 45);

determining, using a generated list of nodes used in routing to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45); and

if it is determined that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of signals to or from the end node, operating the end node to initiate a fault response operation (see paragraph 45);

where the step of determining includes: comparing network node information included in the received fault signal to information in the generated list identifying at least one network node used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45),

determining the fault response operation as a function of information stored in the end node, the stored information relating to a plurality of possible operations (see paragraphs 44 and 45); and

where the step of determining the fault response operation is also performed as a function of the network node at which the fault occurred with the operation being selected from a plurality of possible operations based on both the type of fault and which one of a plurality of network nodes was the node at which the fault occurred.

**Regarding claim 14,** Lehtovirta teaches receiving a fault signal indicating a network node fault (see paragraphs 44 and 45);

determining, using a generated list of nodes used in routing to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45); and

if it is determined that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of signals to or from the end node, operating the end node to initiate a fault response operation (see paragraph 45), the fault response operation being an end node state update operation (see paragraph 46; The end node is sent a reset message.).

**Regarding claim 36,** Lehtovirta further teaches operating a plurality of additional end nodes to receive the fault signal; and operating each of the additional end nodes, in the plurality of additional end nodes, to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of messages to or from the additional end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45).

**Regarding claim 37,** Lehtovirta further teaches operating each additional end node which determines that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing messages to or from the additional end node, to initiate a fault response operation at the additional end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45).

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims **1-3, 5-12, 18, 22, 23, 30, 33, 39, 40, 42-44, 46-49, 52, and 53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Khalil et al. (US 6,578,085).

**Regarding claims 1, 39, 46, 48, and 52,** Lehtovirta teaches receiving a fault signal indicating a network node fault (see paragraphs 44 and 45);

determining, using a generated list of nodes used in routing to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45); and

if it is determined that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of signals to or from the end node, operating the end node to initiate a fault response operation (see paragraph 45).

Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of generating, from Mobile IP signals directed to the end node or transmitted by the end node, a list of network nodes identifying network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node, the Mobile IP signals including at least one of a Mobile IP agent solicitation message, a Mobile IP agent advertisement message, a Mobile IP registration message and a Mobile IP registration reply message.

However, Khalil teaches generating, from Mobile IP signals directed to the end node or transmitted by the end node, a list of network nodes identifying network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node, the Mobile IP signals including at least one of a Mobile IP agent solicitation message, a Mobile IP agent advertisement message, a Mobile IP registration message and a Mobile IP registration reply message (see col. 5 lines 33-42). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to generate the list as taught by Khalil in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for doing so is to generate the list as mobiles register so that is no delay when the list needs to be accessed.

**Regarding claims 2, 47, and 49,** Lehtovirta further teaches comparing network node information included in the received fault signal to information in the generated list identifying at least one network node used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45).

**Regarding claim 3,** Lehtovirta further teaches determining the fault response operation as a function of information stored in the end node, the stored information relating to a plurality of possible operations (see paragraphs 44 and 45).

**Regarding claim 5,** Lehtovirta further teaches using a list of network nodes to determine if the node is used in the routing of signals to the end node (see paragraph 44).

**Regarding claims 6 and 42,** Lehtovirta teaches receiving a fault signal indicating a network node fault (see paragraphs 44 and 45);

determining, using a generated list of nodes used in routing to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45); and

if it is determined that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of signals to or from the end node, operating the end node to initiate a fault response operation (see paragraph 45);

where the step of determining includes: comparing network node information included in the received fault signal to information in the generated list identifying at least one network node used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45),

where the stored information includes information identifying a network node, in the list of network nodes, which is used by the end node (see paragraph 44). Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the node being used by the end node as at least one of a Mobile IP home agent, a SIP proxy server, and a SIP location registrar.

However, Khalil teaches the node being at least one of a Mobile IP home agent, a SIP proxy server, and a SIP location registrar (see col. 5 lines 33-42). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Khalil in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for doing so is to generate the list as mobiles register so that is no delay when the list needs to be accessed.

**Regarding claim 7,** Lehtovirta further teaches the stored information includes information identifying a network node which is used by the end node as an access node through the end node is coupled to other nodes in the communications network (see paragraph 46; The RNC coupled to the base station is used by the end node as an access node.).

**Regarding claim 8,** Lehtovirta further teaches the access node is a base station and the end node is a mobile device that is coupled to the base station by a wireless communications link (see Fig. 1 Boxes 28 and 30).

**Regarding claims 9 and 33,** Lehtovirta further teaches generating at least a portion of the stored information identifying the network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node from information included in signals sent to or from the end node (see paragraph 44). Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention

with the exception of dynamically generating at least a portion of the stored information identifying the network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node from information included in signals sent to or from the end node.

However, Khalil teaches dynamically generating at least a portion of the stored information identifying the network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node from information included in signals sent to or from the end node (see col. 5 lines 33-42; The information is dynamically generated using registration messages.). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Khalil in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for doing so is to generate the list as mobiles register so that is no delay when the list needs to be accessed.

**Regarding claim 10,** Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of dynamically generating at least a portion of the stored information identifying network nodes includes: operating the end node to monitor for non-fault related signals and to generate at least some of the stored information from the monitored non-fault related signals.

However, Khalil teaches dynamically generating at least a portion of the stored information identifying network nodes includes: operating the end node to monitor for non-fault related signals and to generate at least some of the stored information from the monitored non-fault related signals (see col. 5 lines 33-42; The end node monitors for registration reply messages, and the list is generated from registration messages.). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of

Khalil in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for doing so is to generate the list as mobiles register so that is no delay when the list needs to be accessed.

**Regarding claim 11,** Lehtovirta further teaches session signaling messages communicated to or from the end node (see paragraph 49).

**Regarding claim 12,** Lehtovirta further teaches the non-fault related signals are routing messages (see paragraph 10).

**Regarding claim 18,** Lehtovirta further teaches receiving a fault signal at a first network node; and sending a network node fault signal to the end node in response to receiving a fault signal (see paragraph 44).

**Regarding claim 22,** Lehtovirta further teaches operating a plurality of additional end nodes to receive the fault signal; and operating each of the additional end nodes, in the plurality of additional end nodes, to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of messages to or from the additional end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45).

**Regarding claim 23,** Lehtovirta further teaches operating each additional end node which determines that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing messages to or from the additional end node, to initiate a fault response operation at the additional end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45).

**Regarding claim 30,** Lehtovirta further teaches where the stored information includes information identifying a network node, in the list of network nodes, which is used by the end node (see paragraph 44). Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of

the claimed invention with the exception of the node being used by the end node as at least one of a Mobile IP home agent, a SIP proxy server, and a SIP location registrar.

However, Khalil teaches the node being at least one of a Mobile IP home agent, a SIP proxy server, and a SIP location registrar (see col. 5 lines 33-42). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Khalil in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for doing so is to generate the list as mobiles register so that is no delay when the list needs to be accessed.

**Regarding claims 40, 43, and 44,** Lehtovirta further teaches the device includes a wireless transmitter; and where means for receiving includes a radio receiver circuit (see Fig. 1 Box 30). Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of generating, from Mobile IP signals directed to the end node or transmitted by the end node, a list of network nodes identifying network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node, the Mobile IP signals including at least one of a Mobile IP agent solicitation message, a Mobile IP agent advertisement message, a Mobile IP registration message and a Mobile IP registration reply message.

However, Khalil teaches generating, from Mobile IP signals directed to the end node or transmitted by the end node, a list of network nodes identifying network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node, the Mobile IP signals including at least one of a Mobile IP agent solicitation message, a Mobile IP agent advertisement message, a Mobile IP registration message and a Mobile IP registration reply message (see col. 5 lines 33-42). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to generate the list as taught by Khalil in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for

doing so is to generate the list as mobiles register so that is no delay when the list needs to be accessed.

**Regarding claim 53,** Lehtovirta further teaches the device includes a wireless transmitter; and where means for receiving includes a radio receiver circuit (see Fig. 1 Box 30).

8. Claims **13 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Hippelainen et al. (US 2004/0081086).

**Regarding claims 13 and 34,** Lehtovirta teaches receiving a fault signal indicating a network node fault (see paragraphs 44 and 45);

determining, using a generated list of nodes used in routing to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45); and

if it is determined that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of signals to or from the end node, operating the end node to initiate a fault response operation and releasing the resource link in response to the fault (see paragraph 45). Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of a Mobile IP registration operation in response to the fault.

However, Hippelainen teaches releasing a resource link and a Mobile IP registration operation in response to the fault (see paragraph 5). Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Hippelainen in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for doing so is to make the system more reliable.

9. Claims **15-17 and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Khalil et al. (US 6,578,085) as applied to claims **6** and **22** above, and further in view of Bender et al. (US 2003/0016629).

**Regarding claim 15,** Lehtovirta teaches sending a fault message in response to a fault condition (see paragraph 44). Lehtovirta in view of Khalil teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of sending a status request signal from a first network node to a second network node; receiving a response to the status request signal; and sending a network node fault signal to the end node when the response indicates a fault condition. However, Bender teaches sending a status request signal from a first network node to a second network node (see paragraph 35 lines 1-3); and receiving a response to the status request signal.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Bender in the system of Lehtovirta in view of Khalil. The motivation for doing so is the network management device can actively detect a fault without waiting for a fault notification from a different node.

**Regarding claims 16 and 24,** Lehtovirta in view of Khalil teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of periodically sending a status request signal and determining a fault from the lack of a response. However, Bender

teaches periodically sending a status request signal from a first network node to a second network node (see paragraph 35 lines 1-3; A message is sent to a node and the node waits for a predetermined time period for a response. After the time period expires, if no response is received, the node sends another message.), and sending a network node fault signal to the end node when a response to at least one of the periodically received status request signals is not received (see paragraph 35 lines 10-13; Once the number of times no response has been received from the message crosses a threshold, a fault is considered to have occurred.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Bender in the system of Lehtovirta in view of Khalil. The motivation for doing so is the network management device can actively detect a fault without waiting for a fault notification from a different node.

**Regarding claim 17,** Lehtovirta in view of Khalil teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of counting the number of consecutive status request signals sent for which a response is not received and sending a fault signal in response to determining that the maintained count at least equals a threshold number. However, Bender teaches maintaining a count of the number of consecutive status request signals sent to the second node for which a response is not received (see paragraph 35 lines 10-12) and a fault is determined in response to determining that the maintained count at least equals a threshold number (see paragraph 35 lines 10-12).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Bender in the system of Lehtovirta in view of Khalil. The motivation for doing

so is the network management device can actively detect a fault without waiting for a fault notification from a different node.

10. Claims **19-21 and 41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Khalil et al. (US 6,578,085) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Shah (US 5,390,326).

**Regarding claims 19-21 and 41,** Lehtovirta teaches sending signals to a plurality of end nodes (see paragraphs 44 and 45). Khalil teaches sending fault messages using internet protocol (see paragraphs 4 and 5). Lehtovirta in view of Khalil teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of periodically sending fault signals to a plurality of end nodes at preselected time intervals and monitoring for fault signals at preselected time intervals.

However, Shah teaches periodically sending fault signals to a plurality of end nodes at preselected time intervals (see col. 4 lines 44-46 and 53-59); and operating at least some of the plurality of end nodes to monitor for fault signals at the preselected time intervals but not between the preselected time intervals (see col. 4 lines 44-46). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Shah in the system of Lehtovirta in view of Khalil. The motivation for doing so is to allow the nodes only have to monitor for fault signals at the time intervals selected, which allows the nodes to reduce processing power previously spent on constantly monitoring for fault signals.

11. Claim **31** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Gomez (US 6,178,327).

**Regarding claim 31,** Lehtovirta teaches receiving a fault signal indicating a network node fault (see paragraphs 44 and 45);

determining, using a generated list of nodes used in routing to determine if the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing signals to or from the end node (see paragraphs 44 and 45); and

if it is determined that the network node fault corresponds to a network node that is used in routing of signals to or from the end node, operating the end node to initiate a fault response operation (see paragraph 45); and

where the end node is a mobile node connected by a wireless communications link to an access node that is coupled to the indicated network node (see Fig. 1 Boxes 28 and 30), the network node including a stored list of critical nodes and actions to be taken in response to faults at the listed critical nodes.

Lehtovirta teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the mobile node including the list of nodes and the fault responses. However, Gomez teaches the mobile node including the list of nodes and fault responses (see col. 4 line 65 - col. 5 lines 24). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Gomez in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for doing so is to make the system more flexible by allowing the mobile to select the fault response.

12. Claim **32** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Gomez (US 6,178,327) as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Khalil et al. (US 6,578,085).

**Regarding claim 32,** Lehtovirta in view of Gomez teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of generating, from Mobile IP signals directed to the end node or transmitted by the end node, a list of network nodes identifying network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node, the Mobile IP signals including at least one of a Mobile IP agent solicitation message, a Mobile IP agent advertisement message, a Mobile IP registration message and a Mobile IP registration reply message.

However, Khalil teaches generating, from Mobile IP signals directed to the end node or transmitted by the end node, a list of network nodes identifying network nodes used in routing signals to or from the end node, the Mobile IP signals including at least one of a Mobile IP agent solicitation message, a Mobile IP agent advertisement message, a Mobile IP registration message and a Mobile IP registration reply message (see col. 5 lines 33-42). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to generate the list as taught by Khalil in the system of Lehtovirta in view of Gomez. The motivation for doing so is to generate the list as mobiles register so that is no delay when the list needs to be accessed.

13. Claim **35** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Shah (US 5,930,326).

**Regarding claim 35,** Lehtovirta teaches sending signals to a plurality of end nodes (see paragraphs 44 and 45). Khalil teaches sending fault messages using internet protocol (see paragraphs 4 and 5). Lehtovirta in view of Khalil teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of periodically sending fault signals to a plurality of end nodes at preselected time intervals and monitoring for fault signals at preselected time intervals.

However, Shah teaches periodically sending fault signals to a plurality of end nodes at preselected time intervals (see col. 4 lines 44-46 and 53-59); and operating at least some of the plurality of end nodes to monitor for fault signals at the preselected time intervals but not between the preselected time intervals (see col. 4 lines 44-46). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Shah in the system of Lehtovirta in view of Khalil. The motivation for doing so is to allow the nodes only have to monitor for fault signals at the time intervals selected, which allows the nodes to reduce processing power previously spent on constantly monitoring for fault signals.

14. Claim **38** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Keller et al. (US 2004/0049565).

For claim 38, Lehtovirta teaches the service interference notification signal is a message indicating a fault (see paragraphs 44 and 45). Jain teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception that a fault is a service outage. Keller

et al. teach that a service outage is failure of the system, which is considered a fault (see paragraph 15 lines 1-5).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of Keller in the system of Lehtovirta. The motivation for using the method of Keller in the system of Lehtovirta is in the event of the failure of a node in the network, which would cause a break in the connections between the node, to have the system recognize that as a fault.

15. Claim **45** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtovirta et al. (US 2001/0034228) in view of Khalil et al. (US 6,578,085) as applied to claim 44 above, and further in view of Hippelainen et al. (US 2004/0081086).

**Regarding claim 45,** Lehtovirta in view of Khalil teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of a Mobile IP registration operation in response to the fault. However, Hippelainen teaches releasing a resource link and a Mobile IP registration operation in response to the fault (see paragraph 5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Hippelainen in the system of Lehtovirta in view of Khalil. The motivation for doing so is to make the system more reliable.

***Conclusion***

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Betty Lee whose telephone number is (571) 270-1412.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9-5 EST and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BL

EDAN . ORGAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER